

REMARKS

The Office Action has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Consistent with that described in the Office Action, Applicants have corrected formalities regarding the specification and the abstract. Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview on November 25, 2008 and for recognition that the claims as amended would overcome the rejection based on the currently applied references. Claims 1-2 have been amended. Claims 1-3 remain pending.

Objections to the Abstract and the Specification

Applicants have amended the Abstract consistent with the recommendations detailed in the Office Action including removal of language specifically identified as being objectionable. Applicants have also amended the specification of the application to include headings consistent with typical practice before the USPTO.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE-4416969 (hereafter DE '969) in view of Deamborsio (U.S. Pat. No. 5,230,460, hereinafter Deamborsio). Applicants traverse this reject for the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a process chamber of an installation for the thermal treatment of printed circuit boards characterized in that “a fan wheel (30) is open at its two opposing end faces (13, 14) and the two opposing end faces (13, 14) are configured as a pair of intakes at such a distance from the walls (6, 7) of the process chamber that gas flows in unimpeded in two substreams (16, 17) into the two opposing end faces (13, 14) of the fan wheel (30) and flows out from the cylindrical surface of the fan wheel (30) over the length thereof...” As discussed and agreed in the Interview on November 25, 2008, DE '969 and Deamborsio alone or in combination fail to teach or disclose the “two opposing end faces...configured as a pair of intakes...” as recited. See e.g., DE '969 FIGS. 2-4 and Deamborsio FIG. 1. As such, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as described with respect to base claim 1 and in view of the further patentable features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3128.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: December 8, 2008

By: /David R. Gerk/
David R. Gerk, Reg. No. 56,901

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001